



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/719,341	09/25/96	MANNABA S	135V 12522

ANDREW C HESS  
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
ONE NEUMANN WAY M D H17  
CINCINNATI OH 45215-6301

QM61/0921

EXAMINER  
VERBIER, C

ART UNIT 3745	PAPER NUMBER
------------------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 09/21/98

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/719,341**

Applicant(s)  
**Mannava et al.**

Examiner  
**Christopher Verdier**

Group Art Unit  
**3745**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher Verdier

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Steve Rosen

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Sep 14, 1998

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20

Identification of prior art discussed:

None.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner indicated why the declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 is ineffective. The examiner indicated that as set forth in the advisory action dated September 2, 1998, even if a new declaration is submitted which establishes diligence, the declaration is inappropriate under 37 CFR 1.131 (a) because the Mannava Patent '009 claims the same patentable invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

**CHRISTOPHER VERDIER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3745**

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.